

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

IN RE: TAASERA LICENSING LLC,	§	
PATENT LITIGATION	§	
	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:22-MD-03042-JRG
THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO CIVIL	§	
ACTION NO. 2:22-CV-00314-JRG	§	


ORDER

Before the Court is the Unopposed Motion for Leave to File Corrected Version of Reply in Support of Motion for Partial Judgment on the Pleadings (the “Motion”) filed by Palo Alto Networks, Inc. (“Palo Alto”). (Case No. 2:22-md-3042, Dkt. No. 118; Case No. 2:22-cv-314, Dkt. No. 135). In the Motion, Palo Alto requests leave to file a corrected version of its reply brief (Dkt. No. 2:22-md-3042, Dkt. No. 119; Case No. 2:22-cv-314, Dkt. No. 136) to its Motion for Partial Judgment on the Pleadings of Patent-Ineligibility Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 (Dkt. No. 2:22-md-3042, Dkt. No. 71; Case No. 2:22-cv-314, Dkt. No. 109). Palo Alto represents that good cause exists because the corrected reply brief (1) includes correct citations to Defendants[] [Taasera Licensing LLC and Quest Patent Research Corporation’s (collectively, ‘Defendants’)] [r]esponse”; and (2) it “accounts for Defendants’ infringement contentions by identifying the asserted claims.” (Case No. 2:22-md-3042, Dkt. No. 118 at 1–2; Case No. 2:22-cv-314, Dkt. No. 135 at 1–2).

Having considered the Motion, and noting that it is unopposed, the Court finds that it should be and hereby is **GRANTED**. It is therefore **ORDERED** that Palo Alto has leave to file its corrected reply brief (Dkt. No. 2:22-md-3042, Dkt. No. 119; Case No. 2:22-cv-314, Dkt. No.

136) to its Motion for Partial Judgment on the Pleadings of Patent-Ineligibility Under 35 U.S.C. § 101 (Dkt. No. 2:22-md-3042, Dkt. No. 71; Case No. 2:22-cv-314, Dkt. No. 109).

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 25th day of January, 2023.



RODNEY GILSTRAP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE